

AD \_\_\_\_\_

GRANT NUMBER DAMD17-94-J-4333

TITLE: Psycho Educational Group Intervention for Women at  
Increased Risk for Breast Cancer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathryn M. Kash, Ph.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: Strang-Cornell Cancer Research  
Laboratory  
New York, New York 10021

REPORT DATE: November 1997

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual

19980526 079

PREPARED FOR: Commander  
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command  
Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for public release;  
distribution unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved

OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE November 1997	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Annual (30 Sep 96 - 29 Sep 97)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Psycho Educational Group Intervention for Women at Increased Risk for Breast Cancer			5. FUNDING NUMBERS DAMD17-94-J-4333	
6. AUTHOR(S)  Kathryn M. Kash, Ph.D.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  Strang-Cornell Cancer Research Laboratory New York, New York 10021			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Commander U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland 21702-5012			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200)  The goals of this study are: 1) to examine the impact of a psychoeducational intervention on the intermediate outcome variables of knowledge of breast cancer and risk factors, breast cancer beliefs, cancer attitudes, and coping skills in women at increased risk for breast cancer; 2) to examine the impact of a psychoeducational intervention on the endpoint variables of quality of life and adherence to screening in women at increased risk for breast cancer; and 3) to explore the mechanisms by which the psychological intervention may improve quality of life and increase adherence to breast cancer screening in women at increased risk for breast cancer. The design is a randomized two group design in which women are assigned to either the experimental or control group. The intervention (experimental) components include; social support enhancement, education, cognitive restructuring, and problem-solving. A total of 360 are expected to participate in this study over a four year period of time. To date 183 women have agreed to participate in the study and 148 have completed Time 1 assessments, 93 have completed Time 2 assessments; 71 women have completed Time 3 assessments, and 60 women have completed Time 4 assessments. Anecdotal reports from women in the experimental arm indicate that they find the intervention helpful in terms of empowerment through knowledge and in decreasing their anxiety about breast cancer.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS  Breast Cancer      Breast Cancer Risk      Behavioral Medicine Anxiety      Psychological Distress      Screening Adherence			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 18	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	

## FOREWORD

Opinions, interpretations, conclusions and recommendations are those of the author and are not necessarily endorsed by the U.S. Army.

\_\_\_\_ Where copyrighted material is quoted, permission has been obtained to use such material.

\_\_\_\_ Where material from documents designated for limited distribution is quoted, permission has been obtained to use the material.

\_\_\_\_ Citations of commercial organizations and trade names in this report do not constitute an official Department of Army endorsement or approval of the products or services of these organizations.

\_\_\_\_ In conducting research using animals, the investigator(s) adhered to the "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals," prepared by the Committee on Care and Use of Laboratory Animals of the Institute of Laboratory Resources, National Research Council (NIH Publication No. 86-23, Revised 1985).

\_\_\_\_ For the protection of human subjects, the investigator(s) adhered to policies of applicable Federal Law 45 CFR 46.

\_\_\_\_ In conducting research utilizing recombinant DNA technology, the investigator(s) adhered to current guidelines promulgated by the National Institutes of Health.

\_\_\_\_ In the conduct of research utilizing recombinant DNA, the investigator(s) adhered to the NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules.

\_\_\_\_ In the conduct of research involving hazardous organisms, the investigator(s) adhered to the CDC-NIH Guide for Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories.

Kathryn M. Kash      31 December 1997  
PI - Signature      Date

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Front Cover . . . . .	1
II. SF 298 Report Documentation Page . . . . .	2
III. Foreword . . . . .	3
IV. Table of Contents . . . . .	4
V. Introduction	
a. Nature of problem . . . . .	5
b. Background of previous work . . . . .	5
c. Purpose of present work . . . . .	6
d. Methods of approach . . . . .	7
VI. Progress Report	
a. Experimental methods used . . . . .	7
b. Work to date as related to goals . . . . .	8
VII. Conclusions . . . . .	10
VIII. References . . . . .	12
IX. Appendix	
A. Statement of Work from grant proposal . . . . .	13
B. Tables 1, 2, & 3 . . . . .	15

## V. INTRODUCTION

### a. Nature of the problem.

With the increased media attention focused on the importance of the early detection of breast cancer, more women were beginning to recognize the need for breast cancer screening and to look for places (programs, clinics, doctors) where they could obtain quality breast care. As women learn about their family history of breast cancer, they begin to speculate about their own risk. In addition, many women have heard that there is a gene (BRCA1) responsible for a small portion of breast cancer cases that was cloned last year. Already these women are requesting genetic testing as soon as it is available on a clinical level. We need to think about the psychological consequences for these women, as well as the ethical implications. Without adequate information, many women overestimate their risk and become quite fearful that they too could develop breast cancer. Our previous study identified anxiety as predictive of poor adherence to both clinical breast examinations and breast self-examination, as well as delay in having a mammogram (Kash et al, 1992). Thus adherence to breast cancer screening poses a major problem for women at increased risk who need timely screening. The emotional distress may also diminish a woman's quality of life, if the fear of developing breast cancer interferes with goal directed behaviors and problem solving activities. This information compelled us to intercede with women at increased risk for breast cancer and develop an intervention that could help to improve quality of life and increase adherence to breast cancer screening. Since women at increased risk increasingly identify themselves and look for programs where they can not only find out appropriate surveillance guidelines but share their feelings and concerns with others, the efficacy of a group intervention needed to be tested in a controlled trial. This study was designed to examine the role of such an intervention in improving quality of life and increasing adherence to screening behaviors (mammogram, breast self-examination, clinical breast examination). Our previous work, described below, piloted this intervention and found it to be extremely helpful to women in decreasing risk perception and increasing adherence to screening.

### b. Background of previous work

Prior to the grant proposal, we conducted preliminary work on piloting a group psychoeducational intervention. There were three important components to this six week, structured intervention. The first was educating women: a) providing their objective risk status by giving them their own family tree (pedigree), b) clarifying information about breast cancer and risk factors for breast cancer; c) providing information on ways to take control of their lifestyle by changing their eating patterns; d) instructions on breast self-examination using both active and passive methods; and e) reinforcing the importance of adherence to screening guidelines. The second component revolved around cognitive restructuring, which helps to facilitate problem-solving. That is, we encouraged women to use active coping rather than avoidance or denial in dealing with their risk status. In addition, changing cognitions can help to alleviate anxiety and the sense of helplessness. The last component was that of emotional support which helped: a) to decrease the sense of isolation; b) to encourage sharing feelings and thoughts with others; and c) to provide reassurance by and rapport with other women.

In the pilot group ten women were randomly chosen from a group of 100 who responded affirmatively to participating in a group. These ten women completed baseline and six-week assessments. Perceived susceptibility for developing breast cancer significantly decreased ( $p < .02$ ) on paired t-tests during the six weeks and approximated their actual risk, based on risk analysis tables. All of the women reported that their knowledge of breast cancer increased and

misconceptions were clarified. Anxiety and fears about developing breast cancer and its consequences were diminished in 90% of these women. Thirty percent who had never performed BSE began to do so and expressed their intent to perform it monthly. Women felt that the emotional support provided by the group was extremely important, as well as the opportunity to exchange feelings and information with women facing the same problems who coped with them daily, using a range of strategies. At a two month follow-up session, all women reported performing monthly BSE. At six months, one year, two years, and three years, there was 90% adherence to mammogram schedule and CBE; 100% were performing BSE monthly. Seventy-five percent of women also reported using the information from the dietician to reduce their fat intake (Kash, 1991).

Using the information from the above mentioned pilot group, we refined our intervention and developed a structured format for the group leader and session leaders to follow. We collected baseline data via a telephone questionnaire on 20 women and randomized them to either the intervention or control group. Analyses of variances on baseline data revealed no significant differences between the groups on any of the demographic, independent, or outcome variables. Within this model our goals were; to provide women with accurate and clear information on actual risk status, breast cancer, risk factors, methods of risk reduction (e.g., low fat diet), appropriate surveillance procedures; and help women learn how to actively cope with their risk. The group then met for six consecutive weeks. The structure and content of these sessions was similar to that of the pilot group and is described in the manual below.

At the end of the six week group intervention telephone assessments were conducted by a trained interviewer. The interviewer was blind as to which group the woman belonged. Within the intervention group there was a significant increase in knowledge ( $p < .05$ ), a significant decrease in perceived risk or susceptibility ( $p < .015$ ), and a significant decrease in perceived barriers to screening ( $p < .05$ ) between baseline and six weeks (the end of the group). Analyses of variances at Time 2 revealed several changes between the groups: 1) a significant increase ( $p < .005$ ) on knowledge of breast cancer in the experimental group; 2) a significant decrease ( $p < .02$ ) on perceived barriers in the experimental group; and 3) a significant increase ( $p < .03$ ) on knowledge of the risk factors for breast cancer in the experimental group. For example, at Time 2 there were still women in the control group (30%) who thought that being "hit in the breast" increased your chances of developing breast cancer. There were also significant differences between the two groups on perception of risk ( $p < .001$ ) with only the experimental group accurately reporting their risk status. There were no differences between the groups on tension or depression at the end of six weeks. Our preliminary data was reported earlier this year (Kash et al, 1995).

### c. Purpose of the present work

The purpose of this study is to address quality of life and adherence to screening issues associated with being at increased risk for breast cancer. The specific aims are: 1) to examine the impact of a psychoeducational intervention on the intermediate outcome variables of knowledge of breast cancer and risk factors, breast cancer beliefs, cancer attitudes, and coping skills in women at increased risk for breast cancer; 2) to examine the impact of a psychoeducational intervention on the endpoint variables of quality of life and adherence to screening in women at increased risk for breast cancer; and 3) to explore the mechanisms by which the psychological intervention may improve quality of life and increase adherence to breast cancer screening in women at increased risk for breast cancer.

#### d. Methods of approach

The research design uses a randomized controlled trial to test the psychoeducational group intervention. The intervention components (as identified above) include; social support enhancement, education, cognitive restructuring, and problem-solving. A total sample size of 360 is sufficient to allow hypotheses testing. Data will be collected at four points in time; baseline, six weeks, six months, and one year. The variables to be examined are: demographic; risk status; selection method; stressful life events; knowledge of breast cancer and risk factors; breast cancer beliefs; cancer attitudes; coping strategies; quality of life (psychological distress, role, work and family functioning, life satisfaction, satisfaction with health care, and participant goal-directed behaviors); and adherence to CBE, mammogram, and BSE. Preliminary analyses include descriptive statistics, correlational, and principal components analysis. Multivariate analysis of variance with repeated measures and appropriate covariates will be used to test the hypotheses.

### VI. PROGRESS REPORT

#### A. Experimental methods used

The medical and family histories for all women enrolled in the Strang Breast Surveillance Program are reviewed by Dr. Kash (PI) for eligibility to participate in the study. Women are classified as being at low (13 to 19%), moderate (20 to 34%), or high (35 to 50%) risk based on their family histories of breast and/or ovarian cancer (Claus et al, 1991). Examples of low risk are having a mother who developed breast cancer at the age of 40 or a mother who developed breast cancer at age 52 and a maternal grandmother who developed breast cancer at age 60. An example of moderate risk is having a mother, maternal grandmother, and a maternal aunt, all who developed breast cancer in their 50's. Some examples of high risk are: 1) having a mother, maternal grandmother, and three maternal aunts who developed breast cancer in their 40's or 50's; 2) having a mother who developed bilateral breast cancer in her 50's, a father with breast cancer at age 60, a paternal aunt with breast cancer at age 50, and a sister with breast cancer at age 38; or 3) having a mother who developed breast cancer in her 40's, a maternal grandmother who had ovarian cancer in her 50's, and a maternal cousin with bilateral breast cancer in her 40's.

Names of eligible women are randomly selected. Those women selected were sent a letter explaining the purpose and requirements of the study. Each woman who does not respond within a two week period was contacted by telephone by the research assistant and told of the study project and exactly what is being asked of them. It was explained to each woman that after baseline data was obtained they would be randomized to either the experimental (standard care plus an intervention group) or the control (standard care) condition. If the participant agreed, an informed consent was obtained from her prior to the beginning of the study. Part of the informed consent process was to obtain permission from the participants to audio tape record each session and video tape some sessions in order to conduct quality checks and make sure that the outline was adhered to for each session. Baseline data was obtained prior to randomization to either the experimental or control condition. The research assistant remained blind as to which group each woman belonged so as not to influence the interview process.

Prior to the beginning of each intervention group, twenty women were randomly selected from the pool of available participants. The assessment instrument was mailed to these twenty participants and a time set for the baseline assessment telephone interview (T1). After the baseline assessment women were randomized to either the experimental and control condition. When the six session intervention group ended (T2), the assessment instrument was mailed to all participants and a

telephone time set for the post-intervention interviews. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was mailed to the participant with the assessment instrument. Once the telephone interview was finished, the participant mailed the interview back so we could have a hard copy of the data.

Several measures were chosen to assess cognitive, psychological, and behavioral variables. The majority of these measures consist of structured questions and require about 30 minutes to complete. One of the Quality of Life measures, the Patient-Centered Methods, is semi-structured and takes about 20 minutes during the telephone interview, which is done after recording the responses to the structured measures. These measures are assessed at four points in time: T1 – baseline (prior to randomization); T2 – within one week after the six week intervention has ended; T3 – six months after the beginning of the intervention; and T4 – one year after the beginning of the intervention. The measures are listed below.

Measures used

Mammogram adherence  
Clinical breast examination (CBE)  
Breast self-examination (BSE)  
Revised Rand General Well-Being Scale  
Social Adjustment Scale-Self Report  
Patient Satisfaction Subscales  
Life Satisfaction Index  
Patient-Centered Methods  
Knowledge about Breast Cancer and Breast Cancer Screening  
Breast Cancer Beliefs  
Cancer Attitude Scales (Anxiety, Hopelessness, and Adjustment)  
Coping Strategies  
Sociodemographic information  
Stressful Life Events  
Risk status

B. Work to date as related to goals

1. There have been two major reasons why the progress of this study has not proceeded as planned. One is programmatic issues and the other is staff changes. Because of these reasons we halted recruitment to the study for six months (January through June 1997) in order to deal with the problems and improve our recruitment and retention rates. Listed below is what the problems were and what has been done to correct them. Below, in B2, is the work to date as it relates to the Statement of Work. It is clear that this project is now moving forward.

a) Programmatic Issues. We began recruiting for the third wave in October 1996. However, two major changes were made to the surveillance program (Strang Breast Surveillance Program) which is the source of women for this study. For the past ten years the Strang Cancer Prevention Center has provided mammograms (at an outside radiology service) to women in the program at no fee. Insurance assignment was accepted as payment. If women did not have any insurance, the mammogram was provided at no charge and the cost was absorbed by Strang. In January 1997 the administration of Strang withdrew funding for mammograms for women in the surveillance program. While women in this study were exempt from this fee change, approximately 100 women withdrew from the program before we had the opportunity to recruit them. The women who withdrew from the program in order to receive their care elsewhere did so because their insurance company did not cover a mammogram at the radiology associates used by Strang or they



were able to obtain a mammogram at a significantly lower price (less than \$125 while it is \$200 at the radiology associates Strang uses) at a different facility. In addition, the nurse practitioner who was conducting many of the clinical breast examinations resigned and was not replaced. While we still had two examiners (an internist and a breast surgeon), we lost an additional 50 to 100 women who followed the nurse practitioner to her new office.

b) Staff Changes. We have experienced two major staff changes that impacted adversely on this study during the past year. Initially in January 1996 another research assistant was hired in order to focus on recruitment and retention. The research assistant was paid with funds from Strang, not from the grant, as we thought we needed another staff member for this project. The research assistant who was hired first worked under Annie Hernandez, M.A. (until she resigned in November 1996) and then Caroline Moore, M.A. While this research assistant was hired specifically to work on recruitment and retention, she was terminated in December 1996 because of inconsistent work and poor follow through with patient contact. Many of our dropouts in year 2 were the result of this lack of continuity with patients. The other staff change related to the research assistant who was the data manager from the beginning of the study. She was responsible for coding the data, data entry, and data analyses. She resigned in March 1997. Upon examining the data, it was discovered that there were serious mistakes in the data (double entries, coding errors, entry errors, etc.). While recruitment was halted, the entire data set was completely re-entered by Caroline Moore, M.A. (after being instructed and evaluated by the PI on how to code and enter data) while awaiting the arrival of a new data manager (who was hired in July 1997). All data errors were corrected and accurate numbers of participants were generated. The data set is now entirely clean.

Based on 1a and 1b above, we have made several changes to the study. Initially we revised the recruitment letter sent to the women in the surveillance program. The new letter (see attached), which went out in July 1997, explained the study and asked women to call an 800 to decline participation in the study. The letter also mentioned that if we did not hear from them within two weeks we would call them and send out the time 1 questionnaire. In this manner we were asking women to take some responsibility for not wanting to be part of the study. Of the 100 women contacted in this way only six women called to decline participation. Women were telephoned by the research associate and mailed the questionnaire. This has been very successful as we obtained participation from 67 women in five months. In order to step up the recruitment further, we have now begun to contact each woman, not already enrolled in the study (or declined participation), just prior to their clinical appointment and ask them for a few minutes of their time to discuss participation in the study at the time of their visit. This began in December 1997 and women are very receptive in a face-to-face approach. In addition, we have put flyers in the breast center for women with breast cancer to give to their first degree relatives. The flyers outline the purpose of the study and the eligibility criteria.

## 2. Statement of Work (Appendix A)

All five items in **Task 1** have been accomplished. They are as follows.

- a) All the materials to be used with those subjects in the experimental condition were ordered and received. They have been used in each of the experimental groups conducted and will be ordered and used in each year.
- b) All questionnaires to be used in this study were completed. Other paperwork, such as labels being generated, envelopes addressed, and questionnaires copied for distribution to subjects, was also completed.
- c) The Quality of Life measures were finalized and included in the interview packet for subjects.

- d) The psychoeducational intervention manual was completed. However, in response to the critique to the progress report in 1996, it is currently being evaluated and possibly revised.
- e) The new research assistant and the research associate were both trained on how to carry out their various responsibilities, which included, but was not limited to, patient contacts, interviewing subjects, and coding and entering data.

In the Statement of Work the first two items in **Task 2** have been completed as follows.

- a) In the first wave, 170 women were contacted and asked to participate in the study. As anticipated 101 women agreed to participate in the study (59% response rate).
- b) In the second wave, 200 women were contacted and asked to participate in the study. Only 82 women agreed to participate rather than the 120 women we anticipated (41% response rate). Women who declined participation cited their main reasons as; live too far away, can't make commitment to every week for six weeks, inconvenient time (would rather have it on weekends), feel they don't need support right now, and not interested in groups.
- c) In the third wave, 125 women were contacted and asked to participate in the study. This number was significantly less than predicted as we halted recruitment for six months. Sixty-seven (54% response rate) agreed and 40 women (60%) completed the Time 1 assessment.

In the Statement of Work all the items in **Task 3** have been completed (or are ongoing) as scheduled.

- a) In Table 1 is listed the number of women who completed time 1, time 2, time 3, and time 4 questionnaires. The most common reasons women were not interested in participation were: 1) could not commit for six weeks; 2) had small children and did not want to leave them with a babysitter every week; 3) hours of groups inconvenient (prefer a weekend day); and 4) wanted to be randomized to the opposite condition.

- b) See above table.

- c) Data entry began in the seventh month. Table 2 lists the demographics of the participants in the study. Table 3 lists the risk levels and adherence to screening behaviors of the participants.

In the Statement of Work all the items in **Task 4** have been completed (or are ongoing) as scheduled.

- a) All five groups were completed in the first year as planned. Two groups out of six, that were planned, were completed in the second year. Three groups were conducted in year three and there are two new groups planned for January 1998.
- b) The one year "booster" session was conducted for seven groups and the six month "booster" session was conducted for one group.
- c) Dr. Paul Jacobsen, a consultant in behavioral medicine, has conducted quality checks on the consistency and accuracy of the content of the sessions by listening to the audio cassettes.

In the Statement of Work all the items in **Task 5** have not begun and are not scheduled until month 44. This includes the preliminary data analyses (qualitative) as well as the analyses of the personal goals measure (quantitative).

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

This study as designed according to the Statement of Work has had some delays and may require a no-cost extension at the end of the four years. This research project may take a total of five years to complete and we will be examining effects over time. From our initial review of the demographics

data (N=148) there are no differences between those assigned to the experimental or control conditions on the following variables: age, marital status, racial/ethnic background, highest grade completed, employment status, occupation, religion, income, number of children, or actual risk level. It is too early to look at the preliminary data, either qualitative or quantitative.

Anecdotal reports from women in the experimental condition indicate that they have obtained a tremendous amount of knowledge and feel less anxious about carrying out early detection behaviors for breast cancer. One woman in the treatment group, who came in on time for her mammogram, was told there were microcalcifications on her film and she needed to have a biopsy. When she was scheduling it with a breast surgeon she told me that she was not worried. In her words, "I came in right on time for a mammogram and a breast examination because I learned the importance of early detection in the [group] sessions. I'm not really anxious about the procedure or the outcome because my group asked questions about biopsies and I also know that most of these [mammogram findings] are benign. If it weren't for the group, I would not have come in when I was suppose to and I would be really nervous that I do have breast cancer."

## REFERENCES

Claus EB, Risch N, & Thompson WD. (1991). Genetics analysis of breast cancer in the cancer and steroid hormone (CASH) study. American Journal of Human Genetics, 48, 232-242.

Kash KM. (1991). How high risk women cope with breast cancer fears. Paper presented at the 144th meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, New Orleans. May 13-16, 1991.

Kash KM, Holland JC, Halper M, & Miller DG. (1992). Psychological distress and surveillance behaviors of women with a family history of breast cancer. J. Natl. Cancer Inst., 84, 24-30.

Kash KM, Holland JC, Osborne MP, & Miller DG. (1995). Psychological counseling strategies for women at high risk for breast cancer. Monogr Natl Cancer Inst, 17, 73-79.

Kash KM, Holland JC, Osborne MP, Miller DG. (1997). Improving quality of life and increasing adherence to breast cancer screening in women at risk. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 17, p.43.

# APPENDIX A

## **PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL GROUP INTERVENTION FOR WOMEN AT INCREASED RISK FOR BREAST CANCER**

### **Task 1. Preparation of materials, intervention manual & training of staff– Months 1-3:**

- a. Materials to be used with experimental condition will be ordered.
- b. Questionnaires copied, labels created, and envelopes addressed.
- c. Quality of life measures are finalized.
- d. The psychoeducational intervention manual will be completed.
- e. The research assistant, research fellow, and the social worker will be trained in their various responsibilities.

### **Task 2. Randomization of sample and recruitment of participants– Months 3-36**

- a. Eligible women will be randomly sampled and recruited for participation. Recruitment for participation in this study will be done at one year intervals so that all the recruitment will not be done in the first year. In the first wave we will contact 170 women for the first year as we anticipate a 60% response rate and a need for 100 women.
- b. Second wave of recruitment begins (month 12), 200 women will be contacted to insure that we have 120 women for study.
- c. Third wave of recruitment begins (month 24), 200 women will be contacted to insure that we have 120 women for study.
- d. Fourth wave of recruitment begins (month 36), 34 women will be contacted to insure that we have 20 for study.

### **Task 3. Assessments collected– Months 3-48:**

- a. Baseline assessments are collected prior to randomization to experimental (N=180) or control (N=180) condition for a total of eighteen cycles (N=360), with new intervention groups (experimental condition) starting every two months beginning in the third month (months 3-36).
- b. Six week, six month and one year assessments are collected on those in the experimental (intervention group) and control conditions.
- c. Data entry begins in month 5.

### **Task 4. Intervention groups and “booster” sessions conducted– Months 3-48:**

- a. An intervention group (experimental condition) begins every two months, starting in month 3 (5 in the first year, 6 in the second year, 6 in the third year, and 1 in the fourth year).
- b. Six month and one year “booster” sessions are conducted for those in the experimental condition.
- c. Quality checks on consistency and accuracy of content of sessions are performed through the use of audio and video tapes.

### **Task 5. Data analyses– Months 44-48:**

- a. Preliminary data analyses are begun in month 44.
- b. Tests of differences between experimental and control conditions on several variables (e.g., age, referral source, prior screening behavior, psychological distress) are begun in month 44.
- c. MANOVA and MANCOVA with repeated measures are performed starting in month 44.
- d. Final analyses are completed in month 48.

# APPENDIX B

Table 1. Recruitment and Retention Data


---

<u># Recruited</u>	<u># Agreed to Participate</u>	<u>Time 1</u>	<u>Time 2</u>	<u>Time 3</u>	<u>Time 4</u>
Year 01 — 170	101	83	74(1)	63(3)	60(9)
Year 02 — 200	82	25	10(2)	7(5)	0(12)
Year 03 — 125 (6 months)	67	40	9(26)	1(34)	0(35)

---

( ) indicates the number waiting for or not due back yet



Table 2. Demographics of study participants (N=148)


---

Age: range is from 22 to 76 years with a mean of 41 years

<u>Variable</u>	<u>%</u>
Marital Status	
Single or never married	34.7
Married or living as married	49.0
Separated or divorced	10.9
Widowed	2.7
Other	2.7
Ethnic/Racial	
White	90.5
African American	3.4
Hispanic	4.8
Asian	.7
Other	.7
Grade	
High School or GED	4.1
Some college	12.9
College	40.1
Graduate school	32.7
Post-graduate school	9.5
Technical/Vocational	.7
Employment	
Full time	61.2
Part time	17.0
Retired	6.1
Homemaker	9.5
Disabled	.7
Student	2.7
Unemployed	2.7
Religion	
Catholic	32.7
Jewish	40.8
Episcopalian	3.4
Protestant	2.0
Presbyterian	3.4
Baptist	.7
None	10.9
Other	6.1
Children	
No	58.5
Yes	41.5

Table 3. Risk levels and screening behaviors of study participants (N=148)


---

<u>Risk levels</u>	<u>%</u>
Medical risk categories	
Low: 13 - 19%	23.4
Moderate: 20 -34%	37.8
High: 35-50%	38.7
Perception of risk of developing breast cancer	
Extremely likely	11.0
Very likely	31.7
Moderately likely	33.8
Somewhat likely	23.4
Not at all likely	0.0
Medical risk continuum	
13% to 50% based on family history	Mean = 31.83
Perception of risk of developing breast cancer (from 0% to 100%)	
9% to 100%	Mean = 55.32
<u>Screening Behaviors</u>	<u>%</u>
Breast self-examination (BSE)	
Yes	70.7
No	29.3
BSE-how often in the past <u>six</u> months	
from 0 to 48 times	Mean = 6 times
Clinical breast examination (ever had one)	
Yes	99.3
No	.7
Mammogram (ever had one)	
Yes	89.1
No	10.9